

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-27, 30 and 33-35 are currently pending
- Claims 8, 12 and 29 are canceled herein
- Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 13-21, 26 and 30 are amended herein
- New claims 33-35 are added herein

[0003] Support for the amendments to claims 1-4, 9, 11, 13-21, 26 and 30 is found in the specification at least at Lines 11-23 of Page 36, Lines 6-19 of Page 38, Line 8 of Page 39 – Line 7 of Page 41, Lines 11-14 of Page 43, Line 19 of Page 44 – Line 10 of Page 45, FIG. 10 and FIG. 13.

[0004] Furthermore, new claims 33-35 are fully supported by the Application, and therefore do not constitute new matter. Support for these new claims is found in the specification at least at Line 10 of Page 28 – Line 13 of Page 29 and Line 19 of Page 44 – Line 10 of Page 45 and FIG. 13.

[0005] New claims 33-35 are allowable over the cited documents of record at least because these claims depend on a claim which is allowable over the cited documents of record.

Cited Documents

[0006] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- ***Russell: Russell et al.***, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2004/0039964 A1**
- ***Chinnici: Chinnici et al.***, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2003/0191803**
- ***Ernst: Ernst et al.***, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2003/0182308**
- ***Albornoz: Albornoz et al.***, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2005/0154978**

Claims 1-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 29 and 30 Are Non-Obvious Over Russell and Chinnici

[0007] Claims 1-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Russell and Chinnici. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0008] Applicant submits that amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Russell and Chinnici. Applicant submits that the combination of Russell and Chinnici does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- negotiating with a remote entity to determine a negotiated list of known objects, the negotiating comprising:
 - **comparing a version of a first list of object types available to the remote entity with a version of a second list of object types**

- available to a client that intends to transmit a computer-readable object to the remote entity;
- in an event that the version of the second list of object types is more recent than the version of the first list of object types, selecting the first list of object types to be the negotiated list of known objects; and
- in an event that the version of the first list of object types is more recent than the version of the second list of object types, selecting the second list of object types to be the negotiated list of known objects;
- decomposing the computer-readable object into multiple sub-components, including dividing the multiple sub-components into a hierarchy;
- creating a property bag in the hierarchy for holding information of the computer-readable object;
- in an event that a first sub-component of the multiple sub-components is included in the negotiated list of known objects, directly serializing the first sub-component without including any executable code of the first sub-component;
- in an event that a second sub-component of the multiple sub-components is not included in the negotiated list of known objects, creating a sub-property bag within the property bag for the second sub-component to form a hierarchical tree of property bags and recursively serializing properties of the second sub-component, wherein **the hierarchical tree of property bags is limited by at least one of:**
 - **specifying a maximum depth of the hierarchical tree of property bags,**
 - **supporting only certain object types and forcing object types that are derived from the certain object types to conform to respective types;**
- serializing the multiple sub-components and the property bag into a serialized package; and

- transmitting the serialized package to the remote entity

[0009] For the express purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate, at least in part, similar features to those recited in previously presented claim 12. Regarding the rejection of claim 12 in the current Action, the Office has admitted that Russell and Chinnici fail to teach or suggest this similar feature by saying that "Russell as modified does not teach version numbers for an object type list." (See Page 12 of the Action.) The Office then cites Paragraphs [0043], [0044], [0047] and [0061] of Ernst as allegedly teaching this similar feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0010] As amended, claim 1 recites in part, "comparing a version of a first list of object types available to the remote entity with a version of a second list of object types available to a client that intends to transmit a computer-readable object to the remote entity", "in an event that the version of the second list of object types is more recent than the version of the first list of object types, selecting the first list of object types to be the negotiated list of known objects" and "in an event that the version of the first list of object types is more recent than the version of the second list of object types, selecting the second list of object types to be the negotiated list of known objects."

[0011] Although Ernst may describe comparing two versions of resources through respective version numbers, it is the latest version between the two versions that is to be selected in Ernst. (See Paragraphs [0047] - [0050], and FIG. 11 of Ernst for example.) Unlike that which is recited in claim 1, Ernst selects the latest version. Therefore, Ernst's teaching seemingly contradicts with claim 1 recitation of "in an event that the version of the second list of object types is more recent than the version of the

first list of object types, selecting the first list of object types to be the negotiated list of known objects” and “in an event that the version of the first list of object types is more recent than the version of the second list of object types, selecting the second list of object types to be the negotiated list of known objects.”.

[0012] Neither is Albornozy able to remedy these deficiencies of Russell, Chinnici and Ernst. Specifically, Albornozy merely describes efficient creation of data structures that correspond to data formats specified by content models specified within XML schemas. Nowhere in Albornozy is there is teaching or suggestion of comparing versions between two lists.

[0013] Moreover, currently amended claim 1 recites in part that, “the hierarchical tree of property bags is limited by at least one of: specifying a **maximum depth** of the **hierarchical tree of property bags**, and supporting only certain object types and forcing object types that are derived from the certain object types to conform to respective types” (with emphasis added). The Office has admitted that Russell and Chinnici do not teach the above first feature (“maximum depth”) when rejecting claim 15 in the current Action by saying that “Russell as modified does not teach limiting the hierarchy of sub-components by specifying a pre-determined depth for the hierarchy.” (See Page 13 of the Action.) The Office then cites Paragraphs [0062] and [0067] of Albornozy as allegedly teaching this first feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0014] Paragraph [0062] of Albornozy merely describes validating a XML data structure API class such as ensuring a hypothetical ‘phoneNumber’ element to contain exactly 10 numerical digits or an array of elements to have a particular number of elements. This paragraph however does not describe any hierarchical tree or any

limitation on a hierarchical tree, not to mention teaching or suggesting “specifying a maximum depth of the hierarchical tree of property bags” as currently recited in this claim.

[0015] Furthermore, Paragraph [0067] of Albornoz merely describes creating an array of sub-objects for multiple occurrences of current sub-element if maxOccurs for this current sub-element is determined to be greater than one. This paragraph however does not describe any hierarchical tree or any limitation on a hierarchical tree, not to mention teaching or suggesting “specifying a maximum depth of the hierarchical tree of property bags” as currently recited in this claim. Moreover, nowhere in Albornoz is there any teaching or suggestion of this feature.

[0016] In addition, currently amended claim 1 further recites “the hierarchical tree of property bags is limited by ... **supporting only certain object types and forcing object types that are derived from the certain object types to conform to respective types**” (with emphasis added). Nowhere in Albornoz or other cited documents of record teaches or suggests this feature. Specifically, none of the cited documents of record teaches or suggests “supporting only certain object types and **forcing object types that are derived from the certain object types to conform to respective types**” as currently recited in this claim (with emphasis added).

[0017] Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Albornoz is not a valid prior art. To support this proposition, Applicant will submit forthwith a § 131 affidavit to remove Albornoz as a reference. Applicant respectfully requests the Office to consider the affidavit, and if any defect is found therein, inform Applicant’s representative of the defect so that a correction thereof can be timely submitted.

[0018] Consequently, the combination of the cited documents of record does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17

[0019] Claim 8 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Rejection of claim 8 is therefore rendered moot.

[0020] Claims 2-7, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-7, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 26

[0021] Applicant submits that amended independent claim 26 is not obvious in view of the combination of Russell and Chinnici. Applicant submits that the combination of Russell and Chinnici does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- a processor;
- a memory, the memory being allocated for a plurality of computer-executable instructions which are loaded into the memory for execution by the processor, the computer-executable instructions providing a method for communicating objects across the remote boundary, the method comprising:
 - negotiating with a remote entity to determine a list of known objects;

- decomposing the computer-readable object into multiple sub-components, including dividing the multiple sub-components into a hierarchy;
- creating a property bag in the hierarchy for holding information of the computer-readable object;
- in an event that a first sub-component of the multiple sub-components is included in the negotiated list of known objects, directly serializing the first sub-component without including any executable code of the first sub-component;
- in an event that a second sub-component of the multiple sub-components is not included in the negotiated list of known objects, creating a sub-property bag within the property bag for the second sub-component to form a hierarchical tree of property bags and recursively serializing properties of the second sub-component, wherein **the hierarchical tree of property bags is limited by at least one act selected from the group consisting of:**
 - **specifying a maximum depth of the hierarchical tree of property bags,**
 - **supporting only certain object types and forcing object types that are derived from the certain object types to conform to respective types;**
- serializing the multiple sub-components and the property bag into a serialized package; and
- transmitting the serialized package to the remote entity

[0022] Claim 26 recites in part that, “the hierarchical tree of property bags is limited by at least one act selected from the group consisting of: specifying a maximum depth of the hierarchical tree of property bags, and supporting only certain object types and forcing object types that are derived from the certain object types to conform to respective types.” Similar to the above discussions with respect to claim 1, the cited

documents of record fail to teach or suggest these features of claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 27, 29 and 30

[0023] Claim 29 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 is rendered moot.

[0024] Claims 27 and 30 ultimately depend from independent claim 26. As discussed above, claim 26 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 27 and 30 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 Are Non-Obvious Over Russell, Chinnici and Ernst

[0025] Claims 9, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Russell, Chinnici and Ernst. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 12 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Therefore, the rejection of claim 12 is rendered moot.

Dependent Claims 9 and 10

[0026] Claims 9 and 10 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 9 and 10 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 15 and 18-25 Are Non-Obvious Over Russell, Chinnici and Albornoz

[0027] Claims 15 and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Russell, Chinnici and Albornoz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 15 and 18

[0028] Claims 15 and 18 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 15 and 18 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 19

[0029] Applicant submits that amended independent claim 19 is not obvious in view of the combination of Russell, Chinnici and Albornoz. Applicant submits that the combination of Russell, Chinnici and Albornoz does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- receiving a serialized package from a remote entity;
- identifying a hierarchy of sub-components, the hierarchy representing an object of a first type;
- for each sub-component:
 - identifying a type associated with the sub-component;
 - determining whether the identified type is within a list of known object types, wherein the list of known object types has been negotiated with the remote entity before receiving the serialized package **[[on]]** from the remote entity, and wherein **the list of known object is a list of object types available to the remote entity if a version of a list of**

object types available to the remote entity is less recent than a version of a list of object types available to a client that receives the serialized package from the remote entity;

- responding to the determining, wherein the responding comprises instantiating a first object of the type and populating at least one property of the first object with information obtained from within the serialized package, wherein the instantiating and populating are performed when the identified type is within the list of known object types; and
- when the identified type is an unknown object type, responding to the determining, wherein the responding comprises instantiating a second object and populating at least one property of the second object with information obtained from within the serialized package

[0030] Claim 19 recites in part that “the list of known object is a list of object types available to the remote entity if a version of a list of object types available to the remote entity is less recent than a version of a list of object types available to a client that receives the serialized package from the remote entity.” Similar to the above discussions with respect to claim 1, this feature is not taught or suggested by the cited documents of record. Therefore, the cited documents of record, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 20-25

[0031] Claims 20-25 ultimately depend from independent claim 19. As discussed above, claim 19 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 20-25 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

New Claims 33-35

[0032] Claims 33-35 are currently added herein. Claims 33-35 ultimately depend from independent claim 26. As discussed above, claim 26 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 33-35 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0033] For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

[0034] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/kaseychristie40559/
Kasey C. Christie
(kasey@leehayes.com; 509-944-4732)
Registration No. 40,559

Dated: 01/14/2010